arXiv:1704.05182v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 18 Apr 2017

A unified phase diagram for iron-based superconductors

Yanhong Gu,[1,2] Zhaoyu Liu,[1,2] Tao Xie,[1,2] Wenliang Zhang,[1,2] Dongliang Gong,[1,2] Xiaoyan Ma,[1,2] Chunhong Li,[1] Lingxiao Zhao,[1,2] Lifang Lin,[3] Zhuang Xu,[3] Guotai Tan,[3] Genfu Chen,[1,2,4] Zi Yang Meng,[1] Yi-Feng Yang,[1,2,4] Huiqian Luo,[1,*] and Shiliang Li[1,2,4,†]

[1] *Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics, Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*
[2] *School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*
[3] *Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875, China*
[4] *Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing, China*

High-temperature superconductivity is closely adjacent to a long-range antiferromagnetism, which is called as parent compound. In cuprates, all parent compounds are alike and carrier doping leads to superconductivity, so a unified phase diagram can be drawn. However, the properties of parent compounds for iron-based superconductors show significant diversity and both carrier and isovalent doping can cause superconductivity, which cast doubt on the idea that there is a unified phase diagram for them. Here we show that the ordered moments in a variety of iron pnictides are inversely proportional to their effective Curie constants of nematic susceptibility. This unexpected scaling behavior suggests the magnetic ground states of iron pnictides can be achieved by tuning the strength of local nematic fluctuations, which is what various dopants effectively affect. Our results give a natural explanation for the variety of ordered moments in so-called parent compounds. Moreover, a unified phase diagram can be established where superconductivity emerges from a hypothetical parent compound with large ordered moment but little nematic fluctuations, which suggests that iron-based superconductors are strongly correlated electron systems.

PACS numbers:

Iron pnictides share some common behaviors with many other unconventional superconductors such as cuprates and some heavy-fermion superconductors, where superconductivity is achieved by suppressing the long-range antiferromagnetic (AF) order in parent compounds [1, 2]. What we learn from cuprates is that all parent compounds can be treated as Mott insulators and a unified phase diagram can thus be drawn [3]. Superconductivity can be obtained by either hole or electron doping, suggesting that carrier doping can be directly associated with a microscopic quantum parameter. These consensus in cuprates naturally lead to the use of similar terms in iron-based superconductors, such as parent compound, electron and hole doping [4], instead of the fact that there are many phenomena querying such simple adaption. For example, the ordered moment of the AF ground states in parent compounds of iron pnictides varies significantly [5–10], leading to many theoretical efforts but a consensus has not been reached yet [11–14]. In NaFe1-xCoxAs system [15], superconductivity can be found even in the AF parent compound. This large diversity among these materials seems to disqualify them as parent compound, which has long thought to be a Mott insulator [16–20]. Efforts to find such an insulating parent compound have not met with much successes [21–23]. Moreover, achieving superconductivity in iron-based superconductors can be done by not just carrier doping but also isovalent doping [24]. It has been found that chemical substitution leads to the reduction of electronic correlation in most systems [25], but the reason is unknown. These diversities for both parent compounds and their doped materials make it hard to obtain a general picture for low-energy physics as that in cuprates, which seems to suggest that our understanding of antiferromagnetism and superconductivity in iron-based superconductors is not generic but material dependent.

A unique feature for the AF order in iron pnictides is that it is always closely accompanied by a nematic order, which breaks the in-plane C4 rotational symmetry of the high-temperature tetragonal lattice structure while preserving the translational symmetry [26, 27]. Similar nematic order has also been found in cuprates but it is rather associated with the pseudogap in cuprates [28]. It has been shown that the nematic order and its fluctuations may overshadow the whole phase diagram of iron-based superconductors [29–32]. Moreover, a nematic quantum critical point (QCP) has been found in many optimally doped iron pnictides [29–32]. Therefore, nematicity should play a significant role in both antiferromagnetism and superconductivity, and a quantitative relationship between the AF and nematic orders may provide key information on the unified phase diagram of iron-based superconductors.

Here, we perform a detailed investigation on nematic susceptibility of a variety of parent compounds of iron-based superconductors by studying the uniaxial pressure effect on in-plane resistivity. The temperature dependence of nematic susceptibility above the structural transition temperature T_s can be well fitted by a Curie-Weiss-like function, which naturally gives a nematic Curie constant A_n. We show that a manifestatively linear relationship exists between $|An|^{-1}$ and ordered moment in a

variety of parent compounds and doped samples. Our results suggest that it is the local nematic fluctuations that suppress the AF order and drives a system superconducting. Effectively, these so-called parent compounds and their underdoped samples may all lie on a line with a general parent compound at one end and a quantum critical point (QCP) at the other. This picture unifies various iron-based superconductors into a coherent phase diagram.

RFeAsO, $NaFe_{1-x}Ni_xAs$ and $Ca_{1-x}La_xFeAs_2$ single crystals were grown by flux-method similar to those reported previously [33–35]. FeSe single crystals were grown through chemical vapor transport (CVT) method using $AlCl_3$ as the transport agent. Firstly, polycrystalline FeSe was synthesized as predecessor using a solid state reaction by reacting stoichiometric amounts of high purity Fe and Se powders. The predecessor was reground and sealed in an evacuated quartz tube with $AlCl_3$ (3 mg/cm3), which was loaded into a horizontal two-zone furnace with the source end at 400 °C and the sink end at 300 °C. Flake-like single crystals were obtained at the cold end after a few months. The uniaxial pressure dependence of resistivity is measured by the device reported previously [32]. The resistance shows a linear dependence on pressure above T_s for all the samples measured here. We define $\zeta_{(110)} = d(\Delta R/R_0)/dp$, where R_0 is the resistance at zero pressure and $\Delta R = R(p) - R_0$ is the change of resistance under pressure p along the tetragonal (110) direction. As shown in our previous study, $\zeta_{(110)}$ can be well fitted by $A/(T-T')+y_0$, where A, T' and y_0 are all temperature-independence parameters. While the origin of y_0 is not known, it should not be related to nematic fluctuations. We therefore obtain the nematic susceptibility χ_n as $\zeta_{(110)} - y_0$.

Figure 1 gives the temperature dependence of $|\chi|_n^{-1}$ in undoped and doped iron-based superconductors, which can all be fitted by the Curie-Weiss-like function introduced above. In all samples, the fitted T' is a few kelvins lower than T_s, which is consistent with our previous results in $BaFe_{2-x}Ni_xAs_2$ [32]. The T' value of FeSe is much larger than the similar Curie-Weiss temperature obtained by measuring the resistivity change with strain in Ref. [30] but close to that in Ref. [36]. For optimally doped $BaFe_2(As_{0.69}P_{0.31})_2$ and $NaFe_{0.985}Ni_{0.015}As$, T' is close zero, which is consistent with the presence of nematic QCPs [29]. It should be noted that the measurements have been done several times for materials with only small single crystals available to calculate the mean value of A in the above fitting and its standard deviation.

Since the applied uniaxial pressure acts as an external field to the nematic order parameter, A is analogous to the Curie constant of the magnetic susceptibility in a paramagnetic state. Therefore, A is associated with fluctuations from the local nematic order for a second-order transition. However, the effect of Fermi surfaces has to



FIG. 1: Temperature dependence of $|\chi|_n^{-1}$ for various iron-based superconductors. The data include RFeAsO (R = La, Ce, Pr, Nd), $NaFe_{1-x}Ni_xAs$ (x=0, 0.015), FeSe, $BaFe_2(As_{0.69}P_{0.31})_2$, and $Ca_{0.82}La_{0.18}FeAs_2$. Only one set of data is shown for each kind of materials. For FeSe and $NaFe_{0.985}Ni_{0.015}As$, the values of $|\chi|_n$ are negative. The solid lines are linear fitting results.

be considered since A is obtained from resistivity measurements. We introduce a dimensionless parameter κ as $(|\nu_F^\Gamma| + |\nu_F^M|)^2$ normalized by that in $BaFe_2As_2$, where ν_F^Γ and ν_F^M are Fermi velocities at hole and electron pockets above Ts that are nearly nested, respectively. Such form is associated with scattering of spin fluctuations in dirty limit [37] although we cannot rule out other mechanisms that may result in similar form. The nematic Curie constant A_n is thus defined as κA.

Figure 2(a) gives the main result of this paper. The results include parent compounds of three major classes of iron-based superconductors, i.e., "1111" (RFeAsO, where R = La, Ce, Pr, Nd), "Ba-122" ($BaFe_2As_2$), and "111" (NaFeAs). Figure 2(a) also includes the results of $BaFe_{2-x}Ni_xAs_2$ [32] that show the same behavior as the above parent compounds, although Ni dopants are supposed to provide electrons into the system and the doped samples should not be treated as parent compounds. The result of $Ca_{0.82}La_{0.18}FeAs_2$ (112) also falls onto the same line. In the end, we also include three samples without the AF order, i.e., FeSe, optimally doped $NaFe_{1-x}Ni_xAs$ (x = 0.015) and $BaFe_2(As_{1-x}P_x)_2$ (x = 0.31). It is clear that M manifestatively scales linearly with $|A_n|^{-1}$ in a linear fashion as long as it is not zero.

Figure 2(a) shows that high-temperature nematic fluctuations above the nematic transition temperature T_s are associated with the ground state of antiferromagnetism, which is totally unexpected especially considering that the system goes through a nematic transition first with decreasing temperature before entering the long-range AF order. Such discovery suggests that the re-

duction of ordered moment is due to the enhancement of $|A_n|$, which is associated with local nematic fluctuations within the mean-field picture. We note that significant in-plane local variations in the lattice have been observed in $BaFe_2As_2$ at low temperature, suggesting the presence of local nematic frustrations [38]. In other words, the strong local nematic fluctuations frustrate the magnetic system and drive it away from establishing long-range AF order. The difference of ground states among these so-called parent compounds is just a result of the competition between antiferromagnetism and nematicity, which suggests that the effective low-energy physics in iron-based superconductors is governed by both magnetic and nematic correlations. This gives an natural explanation on the long-puzzle that the ordered magnetic moment in so-called parent compounds of iron pnictides is much smaller than the local moment and varies significantly among different materials [11–14].

The linear relationship can be further understood starting from the case of $BaFe_{2-x}Ni_xAs_2$. Doping Ni into $BaFe_2As_2$ gradually suppresses the long-range AF order and superconductivity appears above 3% of Ni doping level [39]. The optimal doping level is achieved at about 0.1, where the AF order also disappears [39]. It is a typical system of iron-based superconductors that superconductivity used to be described as introduced by electron doping. The dashed line in Fig. 2(a) suggests that this process can also be described from another point of view, i.e., Ni doping enhances $|A_n|^{-1}$. While these two descriptions are indistinguishable in $BaFe_{2-x}Ni_xAs_2$, the latter understanding should be more reasonable since this relationship also holds for other compounds as shown in FIg. 2(a).

The above discussions suggest that there is a unified phase diagram for iron pnictides as shown in Fig. 2(b). Compared to the usual way of plotting phase diagram, the most important difference is that the tuning parameter is not carrier doping level but $|A_n|^{-1}$. Superconductivity comes from a hypothetical parent compound (HPC) with large AF ordered moment and little nematic fluctuations by increasing $|A_n|$. The details of electronic structures in undoped materials determine the amplitude of local nematic fluctuations and thus how far they are from the HPC. In this sense, none of the materials studied here is sufficiently qualified as a parent compound since their magnetic ground states can be simply achieved by tuning $|A_n|^{-1}$. The main role played by dopants can be understood as further enhancing nematic fluctuations to suppress the AF order and lead to superconductivity. This is consistent with the observation that various dopants lead to the reduction of electron correlations [25] since nematic fluctuations act as frustration to the magnetic system. Since nematic QCP is widely seen in many iron-based superconductors [29–32], it is expected that it should also present in the phase diagram in Fig. 2(b), which coincides with optimally doping. Of course, the



FIG. 2: (a) Scaling between ordered moment M and $|A_n|^{-1}$. The straight dashed line in the front panel is guided to the eye according to the data of $BaFe_{2-x}Ni_xAs_2$. Superconductivity (SC) tends to appear with sufficient small $|A_n|^{-1}$. The values and error bars of magnetic moments are from previous measurements by neutron diffraction [5–10, 35, 39]. The vertical error bars are the standard deviations of multiple measurements. The values of A_n for $BaFe_{2-x}Ni_xAs_2$ are obtained from previous works [32] assuming Fermi velocities change little with Ni doping. (b) Schematic phase diagram of iron-based superconductors where superconductivity (SC) is achieved by tuning $|A_n|^{-1}$ to suppress the AF order in a hypothetical parent compound (HPC). It should be pointed out that the values of T_N and T_c are material dependent.

actual values of thermal dynamic properties such as T_N and T_c should be material-dependent, but the potions where superconductivity emerges and becomes optimal are still comparable among different families. This phase diagram explains why NaFeAs as a parent compound is so close to superconductivity [15] since its local nematic fluctuations are too strong. It also gives a natural expla-

nation why isovalent doping such as in $BaFe_2(As_{1-x}P_x)_2$ system can also lead to superconductivity as indicated by the small $|A_n|^{-1}$ of the x = 0.31 sample in Fig. 2(a). It is interesting to note that the value of $|A_n|^{-1}$ in FeSe is very close to those in optimally doped $NaFe_{1-x}Ni_xAs$ and $BaFe_2(As_{1-x}P_x)_2$, which may explain why FeSe shows superconductivity without an AF order.

Our results support the idea of treating iron pnictides as strongly correlated systems [1, 2, 16–20] although whether the HPC is a Mott insulator or not remains unclear. Nevertheless, it is thus possible to establish a unified phase diagram of iron-based superconductors similar to cuprates but with the quantum parameter associated with local nematic fluctuations instead of doping. Experimentally, the nematic transition becomes strongly first order for moment larger than 0.9 μ_B (e.g. $SrFe_2As_2$ [40]), which makes the above analysis inappropriate. Moreover, the spin structure changes with further increasing ordered moment (e.g. FeTe [41, 42]). Therefore, the attempt to realize a true parent compound without changing the magnetic structure may be pointless.

In the end, we note that superconductivity has been found in many other iron-based materials [43] where whether the low-energy spin fluctuations are associated with the striped AF order is unknown due to the lack of large-size single crystals. Moreover, a second superconducting dome has been found in H-doped 1111 system [43] and more complicated superconducting and magnetic behaviors are discovered in FeSe under pressure [44]. Whether these phenomena can be understood within the interplay between magnetic and nematic correlations needs to be addressed in future investigations.

In conclusion, we find that the magnetic ground states of a variety of iron-based superconductors can be achieved by tuning the strength of local nematic fluctuations, suggesting the dominant roles played by magnetic and nematic correlations. Accordingly, a unified phase diagram can be established where superconductivity comes from the suppression of the AF order in a hypothetical parent compound by enhancing local nematic fluctuations. Our results provides general understandings on some of the key phenomena in iron-based superconductors, such as the variety of ordered moments in so-called parent compounds and the role of isovalent dopants in generating superconductivity.

S. L. thanks for helpful discussions with Prof. Xiang Tao, Jiangping Hu, Xianggang Qiu, Daoxin Yao and Wei Ku. Y. G. and Z. L. thank help from Jia Yu, Ding Hu and Wei Zhang. This work is supported by the Ministry of Science and Technology of China (No. 2016YFA0300502 and No. 2015CB921300), the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11674406, No. 11374346, No. 11374011, No. 11305257, No. 11674372, No. 11421092 and No. 11574359), the Strategic Priority Research Program(B) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (XDB07020300,XDB07020200), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grants No.2014KJJCB27). H. L. and Y. Y. are supported by the Youth Innovation Promotion Association of CAS. Z. Y. M. is supported by the National Thousand-Young-Talents Program of China.

* Electronic address: hqluo@iphy.ac.cn
† Electronic address: slli@iphy.ac.cn

[1] J. C. S. Davis and D.-H. Lee, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **110**, 17623 (2013).
[2] D. J. Scalapino, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1383 (2012).
[3] P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, and X.-G. Wen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 17 (2006).
[4] P. Dai, Rev. Mod. Phys. **87**, 855 (2015).
[5] C. de la Cruz, Q. Huang, J. W. Lynn, J. Li, W. R. II, J. L. Zarestky, H. A. Mook, G. F. Chen, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang, et al., Nature **453**, 899 (2008).
[6] J. Zhao, Q. Huang, C. de la Cruz, S. Li, J. W. Lynn, Y. Chen, M. A. Green, G. F. Chen, G. Li, Z. Li, et al., Nat. Mater. **7**, 953 (2008).
[7] J. Zhao, Q. Huang, C. de la Cruz, J. W. Lynn, M. D. Lumsden, Z. A. Ren, J. Yang, X. Shen, X. Dong, Z. Zhao, et al., Phys. Rev. B **78**, 132504 (2008).
[8] Y. Chen, J. W. Lynn, J. Li, G. F. Chen, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang, P. C. Dai, C. de la Cruz, and H. A. Mook, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 064515 (2008).
[9] Q. Huang, Y. Qiu, W. Bao, M. A. Green, J. Lynn, Y. C. Gasparovic, T. Wu, G. Wu, and X. H. Chen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 257003 (2008).
[10] S. Li, C. de la Cruz, Q. Huang, G. F. Chen, T.-L. Xia, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang, and P. Dai, Phys. Rev. B **80**, 020504(R) (2009).
[11] Z. P. Yin, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar, Nat. Phys. **7**, 294 (2011).
[12] Z. P. Yin, K. Haule, and G. Kotliar, Nat. Mater. **10**, 932 (2011).
[13] A. Toschi, R. Arita, P. Hansmann, G. Sangiovanni, and K. Held, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 064411 (2012).
[14] Y.-T. Tam, D.-X. Yao, and W. Ku, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 117001 (2015).
[15] A. F. Wang, X. G. Luo, Y. J. Yan, J. J. Ying, Z. J. Xiang, G. J. Ye, P. Cheng, Z. Y. Li, W. J. Hu, and X. H. Chen, Phys. Rev. B **85**, 224512 (2012).
[16] Q. Si and E. Abrahams, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 076401 (2008).
[17] C. Fang, H. Yao, W.-F. Tsai, J. Hu, and S. A. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 224509 (2008).
[18] C. Xu, M. Müller, and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 020501(R) (2008).
[19] H. Ishida and A. Liebsch, Phys. Rev. B **81**, 054513 (2010).
[20] R. Yu, P. Goswami, Q. Si, P. Nikolic, and J.-X. Zhu, Nat. Commun. **4**, 2783 (2013).
[21] E. Dagotto, Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 849 (2013).
[22] M.-H. Fang, H.-D. Wang, C.-H. Dong, Z.-J. Li, C.-M. Feng, J. Chen, and H. Q. Yuan, Europhys. Lett. **94**, 27009 (2011).
[23] Y. J. Yan, M. Zhang, A. F. Wang, J. J. Ying, Z. Y. Li, W. Qin, X. G. Luo, J. Q. Li, J. Hu, and X. H. Chen, Sci. Rep. **2**, 212 (2011).

[24] S. Kasahara, T. Shibauchi, K. Hashimoto, K. Ikada, S. Tonegawa, R. Okazaki, H. Shishido, H. Ikeda, H. Takeya, K. Hirata, et al., Phys. Rev. B **81**, 184519 (2010).

[25] Z. R. Ye, Y. Zhang, F. Chen, M. Xu, J. Jiang, X. H. Niu, C. H. P. Wen, L. Y. Xing, X. C. Wang, C. Q. Jin, et al., Phys. Rev. X **4**, 031041 (2014).

[26] J.-H. Chu, J. G. Analytis, K. D. Greve, P. L. McMahon, Z. Islam, Y. Yamamoto, and I. R. Fisher, Science **329**, 824 (2010).

[27] R. M. Fernandes, A. V. Chubukov, and J. Schmalian, Nat. Phys. **10**, 97 (2014).

[28] R. Daou, J. Chang, D. LeBoeuf, O. Cyr-Choinîere, F. Laliberté, N. Doiron-Leyraud, B. J. Ramshaw, R. Liang, D. A. Bonn, W. N. Hardy, et al., Nature **463**, 519 (2010).

[29] H.-H. Kuo, J.-H. Chu, J. C. Palmstrom, S. A. Kivelson, and I. R. Fisher, Science **352**, 958 (2016).

[30] S. Hosoia, K. Matsuuraa, K. Ishidaa, H. Wanga, Y. Mizukamia, T. Watashigeb, S. Kasaharab, Y. Matsudab, and T. Shibauchia, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **113**, 8139 (2016).

[31] V. K. Thorsmϕlle, M. Khodas, Z. P. Yin, C. Zhang, S. V. Carr, P. Dai, and G. Blumberg, Phys. Rev. B **93**, 054515 (2016).

[32] Z. Liu, Y. Gu, W. Zhang, D. Gong, W. Zhang, T. Xie, X. Lu, X. Ma, X. Zhang, R. Zhang, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 157002 (2016).

[33] J.-Q. Yan, S. Nandi, J. L. Zarestky, W. Tian, A. Kreyssig, B. Jensen, A. Kracher, K. W. Dennis, R. J. McQueeney, A. I. Goldman, et al., Appl. Phys. Lett. **95**, 222504 (2009).

[34] G. Tan, P. Zheng, X. Wang, Y. Chen, X. Zhang, J. Luo, T. Netherton, Y. Song, P. Dai, C. Zhang, et al., Phys. Rev. B **87**, 144512 (2013).

[35] T. Xie, S. Li, and H. L. et al., unpublished.

[36] M. Tanatar, A. Bhmer, E. Timmons, M. Schtt, G. Drachuck, V. Taufour, K. Kothapalli, A. Kreyssig, S. Budo, P. Canfield, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 127001 (2016).

[37] R. M. Fernandes, E. Abrahams, and J. Schmalian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 217002 (2011).

[38] J. L. Niedziela, M. A. McGuire, and T. Egami, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 174113 (2012).

[39] H. Luo, R. Zhang, M. Laver, Z. Yamani, M. Wang, X. Lu, M. Wang, Y. Chen, S. Li, S. Chang, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 247002 (2012).

[40] J. Zhao, W. Ratcliff-II, J. W. Lynn, G. F. Chen, J. L. Luo, N. L. Wang, J. Hu, and P. Dai, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 140504(R) (2008).

[41] W. Bao, Y. Qiu, Q. Huang, M. A. Green, P. Zajdel, M. R. Fitzsimmons, M. Zhernenkov, S. Chang, M. Fang, B. Qian, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 247001 (2009).

[42] S. Li, C. de la Cruz, Q. Huang, Y. Chen, J. W. Lynn, J. Hu, Y.-L. Huang, F.-C. Hsu, K.-W. Yeh, M.-K. Wu, et al., Phys. Rev. B **79**, 054503 (2009).

[43] H. Hosono and K. Kuroki, Physica C **514**, 399 (2015).

[44] J. P. Sun, K. Matsuura, G. Z. Ye, Y. Mizukami, M. Shimozawa, K. Matsubayashi, M. Yamashita, T. Watashige, S. Kasahara, Y. Matsuda, et al., Nat. Commun. **7**, 12146 (2016).